



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Department—subscribing the oath of allegiance, and paying a fee of one dollar. Its duration was fixed in 1873 at two years. It is now the rule, instead of granting a renewal of the passport at the end of that period, to require an application for a new one.

Part II., which contains a full and admirably arranged digest of the laws and decisions relating to the issuance of these documents, shows, among other things, how many perplexing questions arise concerning citizenship. Our courts hold many persons to be citizens to whom our executive officers cannot issue passports. Not to speak of those who, being neither white persons nor Africans, are occasionally admitted to citizenship in disregard of the statute, nor of those whose papers show that they were prematurely or irregularly naturalized, there are many whose applications for passports must be denied, because, though for some purposes citizens, they cannot be effectively protected by our government, or because they must be considered as having abandoned their citizenship for purposes of protection. A foreign woman who has married one of our citizens, but who has always continued to reside in the country of her birth, may have dower in her husband's property in this country, but she will not be entitled to an American passport, on account of the possible rival claim of the sovereign in whose jurisdiction she has remained.

We advocate the right of expatriation, but no law of ours defines what shall constitute a renunciation of nationality. Undoubtedly the Department of State would have raised every presumption in favor of the conservation of American citizenship, had native citizens alone been involved. But naturalization has been sought here by many to be used as a protection from obligations of citizenship in their own countries, to which they hasten to return as soon as they are made American citizens. Their conduct has made necessary the adoption of harsh rules of presumption concerning the abandonment of citizenship, which are applicable, with few exceptions, to all Americans residing abroad, whether native or naturalized. It may be asked: Why not distinguish between the two classes of citizens, as the English do, in issuing passports? Because an act of Congress expressly provides that all naturalized citizens, while in foreign countries, shall be entitled to and shall receive from this government the same protection which is accorded to native-born citizens. Practically the same form of passport is, in consequence, issued to both classes.

E. I. RENICK.

Rhode Island and the Formation of the Union. By FRANK GREENE BATES, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in Alfred University. [Columbia University Studies in Political Science, History and Public Law, Vol. X., No. 2.] (New York. 1898. Pp. 220.)

THE drift of each of the original states into the Union has a peculiar interest. What led to hope and confidence in one colony aroused fear

and distrust in another, while different sections in the same colony opposed each other on the question of federal organization. Keen as was the interest in many places at the time, its common height was reached when Rhode Island, last and least of the thirteen, stood apart from her sister colonies in solitary independence. Why was it? Would she remain so? What would be the result, both as to her and the Union? Such were the questions which stirred the country, and the study of her position during those two-and-a-half eventful years still claims attention. It has received close scrutiny in the volume before us. A son of Rhode Island, Professor Bates had the advantage of a knowledge of the people, which gave insight into their traditions and characteristics, and of an education outside of its borders, which led to an impartial search for the motives by which they were impelled. The result is a full, fair and plain statement of facts, drawn from all available sources, glossing nothing, but showing how rural towns were led long to oppose and finally to accept the necessity of a national government. Rhode Island was not, in this respect, greatly different from several of the states, but it was hampered by peculiar conditions, whose causes and effects are carefully explained.

Beginning with a sketch of the settlements and their development, Dr. Bates points out their distinguishing traits of independence and religious freedom as those which had a permanent influence upon the united colony. The special conditions at the adoption of the federal Constitution brought results like those in our own time, when financial troubles have divided agricultural and commercial sections. Thus the towns pulled apart and gave way to bitter strife. There was no established church, as in other colonies, to unite the people around a common centre, and hence political difference became the more intense.

While it is quite true that most of the paper-money party opposed the Constitution and that it formed the nucleus of the Anti-Federal party, it does not follow that the opposition was based upon an adherence to paper money, for, in all the colonies, even where economic heresies did not prevail, there was much distrust of the new Union, and in Rhode Island men differing on that question were found for and against the Constitution. The author gives undue prominence to that issue, then practically dead, by leaving an impression that it blinded the colony to its patriotic duty. There were other ample grounds for hesitation. In an untried scheme, the smallest colony might well be fearful for her independence, in so close a union with more powerful colonies. She demanded guaranties. Above all, it was feared that the principle of religious liberty, on which the colony was founded, might be overthrown. But after the assurance of the first and tenth amendments, removing all fear of an established religion and of usurpation by the central government of rights not granted by the states, Rhode Island speedily accepted the Constitution. Certainly it was not a lack of patriotism that delayed her. In acts of independence and resistance to British authority she had been in advance of a ther colonies. All this is recognized by the author, but not so strongly relied on as it might be. He draws his con-

clusions from the signs of the times with rigid strictness. It is an interesting study and admirably unfolded. A copious and helpful bibliography is added.

JOHN H. STINESS.

The Jacksonian Epoch. By CHARLES H. PECK. (New York : Harper and Brothers. 1899. Pp. viii, 472.)

THIS is a plainly told and interesting account of our politics from Jackson's victory at New Orleans in 1815 to the Democratic defeat in 1840. The public history of that quarter-century in the United States has so often been told, both generally and in minute detail, and has been lighted up by so much biographical industry, that it would be difficult indeed for anyone to change the distinct and probably permanent picture of it which we already possess. Conscious, no doubt, of this difficulty, Mr. Peck has sought an original treatment of the period, as a Jackson-Clay "epoch," in a separation of the careers and rivalry of the two leaders and of the causes with which they were concerned from the continuity and generality of our history. He has, besides, hit upon the device of an account of public events which shall be more biographical than history and more historical than biography. But the difficulty with this is obvious, that the result must likewise be less historical than history and less biographical than biography. Although it escapes one limitation of each, it does not reach the complete and artistic result of either. In the general method necessary to the treatment of a political epoch, personal details quite suitable for biography, but irrelevant and uncharacteristic for history, have a forced and distracting effect. The reader finds it a wrench to be suddenly carried from disquisition or narrative of an epochal character to genealogical particulars about a political leader. The author's faculty for writing history includes so much clearness and fairness, that it is not, perhaps, ungracious to express the hope that he will hereafter give us an important work written under no obligation to a theory the seeming novelty of which must be open to suspicion in so old, so very old, a field. Let us have biography or let us have history, each remaining itself, though calling upon the other for appropriate and subordinate help.

Mr. Peck is broad in sympathy and liberal in judgment. He scrupulously sums up the material facts ; and if his conclusions need correction, his reader is helped to make it. He sketches Jackson, Clay, Calhoun, Van Buren and Benton in lifelike fashion ; and he generously judges them all. Such generosity is, no doubt, essential to truth when one deals with the career of a man crowded by the exigencies of public life, amidst which the precarious and threatening inconsistencies of effective public opinion although they cannot always be resisted, must nevertheless be skillfully avoided, if there is to be that practical result by which alone statesmen are judged even at the bar of impartial history.

It is difficult, however, to agree with the author's comparative estimate of Jackson and Clay which, no doubt, is the *pièce de résistance* of his